REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 13, 14, 19, 24, 30, 31, 37, 38, 45, 46, 51, and 52 have been amended. Claims 1 – 57 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §101

Claims 24 – 29, 37 – 44, and 51 – 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 24, 37, and 51 have been amended to recite a medium for storing a computer program. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1 – 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Andersson et al, US Pub No. 2002/0004843 A1 ("Andersson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant's exemplary claim 1 recites:

> "A method for bridging network traffic in a networking device having a plurality of communication interfaces, the method comprising:
> creating a bridged routing entry in a bridged routing table that is separate from a main routing table for bridging a first communication interface and a second communication interface before requiring a bridge between the predetermined pair of communication interfaces;
> subsequently determining that a bridge is needed between the first communication interface and the second communication interface; and
> establishing the bridge between the first communication interface and the second communication interface using the bridged routing entry."

The Applicant's invention presents a novel means of providing temporary bridging, which is useful for example in the event of a link or line card failure. A main routing table is used for routing during normal operation. A separate bridged routing table is created, but is not used until it is determined that bridging is needed.

In contrast, Andersson sets forth a method of pre-computing recovery paths for bypassing network changes. The recovery paths are stored as entries in a single routing table, as shown in Figure 3C of Andersson. Andersson therefore fails to teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed method including the step of "creating a bridged routing entry in a bridged routing table that is separate from a main routing table for bridging a first communication interface and a second communication interface before requiring a bridge between the predetermined pair of communication interfaces". The applicant therefore respectfully requests that claim 1 be placed in condition for allowance. The applicant also requests that claims 2 – 5, dependent from claim 1, also be placed in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 6, 13, 19, 24, 30, 37, 45, and 51 contain similar limitations. It is therefore respectfully requested that these claims and the claims dependent from them be placed in condition for allowance for the same reasons as set forth with regard to claim 1.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mary Steubing, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

6/15/04
Date

Mary Steubing, Reg. No. 37,946
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park Drive
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-186
Dd: 6/18/2004